

EXHIBIT 14
FILED UNDER SEAL

Message

From: sshank@google.com [sshank@google.com]
Sent: 2/8/2022 4:08:47 PM
To: sshank@google.com; christowm@google.com; ralfharing@google.com; seenuu@google.com; bentoll@google.com; kaliberto@google.com; angelaying@google.com; bobbrose@google.com; jayhlee@google.com; dharan@google.com; andrewmenendez@google.com; nicolasbize@google.com
Subject: AAAAZhZnT2Q-MBI-THREADED:-B4SvBKU64s%%2022-02-07T21:08:47.989135

- **sshank@google.com** 2022-02-08T16:08:47.989Z

30 days seems far too short. records-retention@google.com is the alias to raise this up to.

- **christowm@google.com** 2022-02-08T17:34:21.154Z

30 days is only for 1-1 conversations with history on. It is 18 months for group conversations with history on or for spaces.

- **christowm@google.com** 2022-02-08T17:34:47.135Z

When you say 30 days is too short. Why is that too short for 1-1's?

- **ralfharing@google.com** 2022-02-08T17:40:52.936Z

because chat is not ephemeral

- **ralfharing@google.com** 2022-02-08T17:41:08.612Z

it remains potentially useful forever

- **seenuu@google.com** 2022-02-08T17:48:46.442Z

+100 to this. At every one of my previous jobs, it's been the case that people (including myself) have searched / gone back multiple months in 1-1 chat histories in order to find key aspects of prior discussions and conversations. In many cases, the 1-1 chat history is the only summary of something that was discussed in a brief face-to-face conversation (hallways / lunch tables / video chat etc.).

As an example: At PayPal (my previous company), all chat history was preserved for 3 years.

- **bentoll@google.com** 2022-02-08T17:50:53.389Z

Chat probably isn't the best way to archive important information for reference later 

- **kaliberto@google.com** 2022-02-08T17:51:27.854Z

it's a risk management issue.

- **kaliberto@google.com** 2022-02-08T17:52:19.691Z

One on one chats are more likely to be taken out content, especially as some records age out in other systems. The communication patterns tend to be more hyperbolic and disciplined.

- **Updated on** 2022-02-08T17:52:32.435Z

One on one chats are more likely to be taken out content, especially as some records age out in other systems. The communication patterns tend to be more hyperbolic and undisciplined.

- **seenuu@google.com** 2022-02-08T17:52:29.142Z

funnily enough, that's exactly why PayPal preserved it for 3 years - philosophy was "if you're communicating using a company tool, assume it's legally discoverable"

- **christowm@google.com** 2022-02-08T17:52:55.426Z

every company has a different philosophy on retention and appetite for risk

- **angelaying@google.com** 2022-02-08T17:54:14.152Z

just curious, what kind of information is most useful in your 1:1s? ie is it shared docs, or back and forth discussions, or something else?

- **sshank@google.com** 2022-02-08T17:55:07.537Z

Understood, though I wish we (Google) had a bigger appetite. I know that I can store important information elsewhere, but I don't always know what is important at the time and I don't want to spend time looking when a solution exists. I've worked in larger organizations that managed this risk. From what I understand, I see this as a detriment to productivity.

- **sshank@google.com** 2022-02-08T17:55:29.162Z

and why 30 days? Why not 60, 90? What is important about 30?

- **kaliberto@google.com** 2022-02-08T17:55:45.766Z

Records retention patterns should be part of curated collaboration culture. So neither allowing it to run wild or to bulldoze it.

- **bobbrose@google.com** 2022-02-08T17:58:56.861Z

2 thoughts -1) We should make it more obvious to the user, eg, where it says "HISTORY IS ON", could add "Messages saved for 30 days" so people know it's not permanent. 2) Offer a way to save chats. Copy/paste into a doc is tedious, difficult to format, and also not obvious to the user. An "export chat to..." "(PDF, Google Doc, etc) and the user can select a date range or "all". This makes it clear that if you need the chat history, you can save it.

- **christowm@google.com** 2022-02-08T18:00:47.824Z

Steve, I understand your viewpoint. Looking at it from the other side though, the amount of "noise" that would be retained for a long time if there was a longer retention period, would increase the risk for Google (as already mentioned) and increase the cost of eDiscovery by a whole lot (in the millions or more).

- **jayhlee@google.com** 2022-02-08T18:07:54.959Z

30-day retention for google.com 1:1 Chat reminds me of the "Do not iron while wearing this clothing" disclaimers, it got there for a very specific reason 😊

- <http://google.com>

- **sshank@google.com** 2022-02-08T18:09:15.069Z

@Mitch Christow fair point, how do other organizations work around this? The users/tools ability to handle search have made cutting through noise a minor chore for end users, myself included. Are there not ways to solve for this on the backend (I'm not an expert)? I'd be curious to see how we weigh the potential loss in productivity to the cost of management overhead. Further to that, I'm curious how our customers set their retention policies. Expense and costly on the backend perhaps, but what serves end users the most?

- **Updated on** 2022-02-08T18:10:49.664Z

@Mitch Christow fair point, how do other organizations work around this? The users/tools ability to handle search have made cutting through noise a minor chore for end users, myself included. Are there not ways to solve for this on the backend (I'm not an expert)? I'd be curious to see how we weigh the potential loss in productivity to the cost of management overhead. Further to that, I'm curious how our customers set their retention policies. Expense and costly on the backend perhaps, but what serves end users the most?

- **ralfsharing@google.com** 2022-02-08T18:09:39.667Z

part of this is fighting against a culture google itself promulgated starting with gmail. "never delete anything, archive, archive, archive, then search later"

- **dharan@google.com** 2022-02-08T18:16:47.073Z

[aside re: Gmail - Google promulgated that externally with Gmail, but it is also worth noting that corp Gmail only lasts for 18 months. I don't think this is covered in Noogler training and I think a lot of people are surprised

by it. It can be particularly challenging for promo situations where some of the useful artifacts are emails and there have been more than 18 months between promos.]

- **Updated on** 2022-02-08T18:17:23.851Z

[aside re: Gmail - Google promulgated that externally with Gmail, but it is also worth noting that corp Gmail only lasts for 18 months (unless you explicitly Vault it). I don't think this is covered in Noogler training and I think a lot of people are surprised by it. It can be particularly challenging for promo situations where some of the useful artifacts are emails and there have been more than 18 months between promos.]

- **andrewmenendez@google.com** 2022-02-08T18:18:31.430Z

This was a very frequent discussion w/ Slack customers and the various perspectives in this thread were all represented. One large customer decided to set an aggressive policy (roughly 30 day IIRC) and faced an uproar - and ultimately demanded that the data be restored (at great expense). Subsequently they wanted to build a custom system for flagging messages as "important" such that they would be skipped over by the deletion routines. Funnily enough I think they got this idea from Email labels.

- **Updated on** 2022-02-08T18:18:53.787Z

This was a very frequent discussion w/ Slack customers and the various perspectives in this thread were all represented. One large customer decided to set an aggressive policy (roughly 30 day IIRC) and faced an uproar - and ultimately demanded that the data be restored (at great expense). Subsequently they wanted to build a custom system for flagging messages as "important" such that they would be skipped over by the deletion routines. Funnily enough I think they got this idea from email labels.

- **andrewmenendez@google.com** 2022-02-08T18:19:32.245Z

a labeling system could be an interesting middle ground (like our indef label)

<https://sites.google.com/a/google.com/docsftw/productivity-tips/google-apps/managing-gmail/keeping-your-emails-indefinitely>

- <https://sites.google.com/a/google.com/docsftw/productivity-tips/google-apps/managing-gmail/keeping-your-emails-indefinitely>

- **nicolasbize@google.com** 2022-02-08T18:19:41.342Z

I like @Bob Rose 's suggestions on improving the user's understanding of the data retention policies. @Ravi Kanneganti FYI

FWIW we are aiming at providing better transitions/collaboration between apps to suit the various use cases. For example, we already have the ability to forward important chat conversations to gmail, or kickstart/edit docs inline with chat conversations.

- **christowm@google.com** 2022-02-08T18:20:59.438Z

@Steve Shank all good questions. Let me see if I can give adequate answers. First off though a public service disclaimer: "I am not a lawyer and I don't play one on TV. All opinions listed here are mine and mine alone and do not represent legal advice.". I think the lawyers would want me to say this. 😊

Now we have a range of customer attitudes towards 1-1 retention. From "though shalt never keep history for 1:1 as it is ephemeral and users have a right to privacy." (mostly European companies that have a higher focus on individual user privacy - even in corp settings) all the way to "We need to keep all the records for eternity as we won't know if people will say something important and smart in a 1:1. (mostly public sector customers).

In terms of choosing another mechanism to retain information, besides using a straight up date range, that can become very tricky.

1. Let's say you keep history on for everyone, but allow for users to delete content themselves that they do not deem important, relevant, or worthy of keeping. That puts the burden of curation on the individual users, and as you can imagine is very inconsistent. Even the most diligent content curator will tire of doing this after a few months.

2. If you create some other mechanism of deletion - let's say by looking for keywords in the content or by

autotagging stuff, you may run into questions on the selection criteria in a case. "why did you decide to use criteria x to delete data rather than criteria y" and so it may look arbitrary at best and like you were trying to hide something from the courts at worst.

Using a date range is essentially the most impartial way that people have found without the disposition of data looking like you are destroying evidence.

- **christowm@google.com** 2022-02-08T18:23:30.385Z

@Ramesh Dharan the gmail retention policy is mentioned during orientation and Nooglers are apprised of its existence. Furthermore 18 months only applies to emails that you have actually opened. Unread emails are dispositioned after 6 months. Drafts are deleted after 30 days.

https://support.google.com/info-gov/answer/7050488?hl=en&ref_topic=10252791

- https://support.google.com/info-gov/answer/7050488?hl=en&ref_topic=10252791

- **christowm@google.com** 2022-02-08T18:24:51.208Z

Also, Google has rolled out a new retention policy for Meet video recordings of 90 day retention.

https://support.google.com/info-gov/answer/10583889?hl=en&ref_topic=10252791

- https://support.google.com/info-gov/answer/10583889?hl=en&ref_topic=10252791

- **kaliberto@google.com** 2022-02-08T18:28:37.920Z

Also, as soon as you put *any* capability in place to retain content at the user's discretion...someone will abuse it. So not only do have to worry about the policy being inconsistent, you also have to worry about that one jerk who is using a greasemonkey script to keep any of their crap from being deleted.

- **christowm@google.com** 2022-02-08T18:29:26.351Z

Very colorful

- **andrewmenendez@google.com** 2022-02-08T18:29:52.203Z

I wonder if digital hoarding is in the DSM-5

- **Deleted on** 2022-02-08T18:30:24.528Z

I wonder if digital hoarding is in the DSM-5

- **kaliberto@google.com** 2022-02-08T18:34:52.615Z

It's a shame because we're so good at sentiment analysis and knowledge graphing. We could probably do some really cool stuff to reduce risk around retaining data.

- **christowm@google.com** 2022-02-08T18:37:18.590Z

Shameless plug: I am going to give a PM talk about Google Vault and info gov and eDiscovery during the week of Feb 21. If people are interested, I'd love to have an audience larger than 2 for the PM talk. I'll post the invite here once it is scheduled.